

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
JULY 26, 2005

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. Committee members present were Chair Bob Breslau, Vice-Chair Julie Aitken, Sam Engel, Jr., and Jeff Evans. Also present were Deputy Planning and Zoning Manager Marcie Nolan, Planners Chris Gratz and Phillip Bachers and Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting. James Aucamp, Jr. was absent.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: June 21, 2005

Vice-Chair Aitken made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve the minutes of June 21, 2005. In a voice vote, with Mr. Aucamp being absent, all voted in favor. Motion carried 4-0

3. SELECTION OF CHAIR

Mr. Engel nominated Vice-Chair Aitken, seconded by Chair Breslau who had passed the gavel. There were no other nominations. In a voice vote, with Mr. Aucamp being absent, all voted in favor.

4. SELECTION OF VICE CHAIR

Mr. Evans nominated Mr. Engel, seconded by Chair Aitken who had passed the gavel. There were no other nominations. In a voice vote, with Mr. Aucamp being absent, all voted in favor.

5. SITE PLANS

5.1 SP 5-5-04, Shenandoah Square, 13600 State Road 84 (B-2)

Paul Bohaboy, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. Abramson summarized the planning report.

Color samples had been provided in the individual packets and Mr. Bohaboy indicated that in the computerized renderings and elevations, the colors were misrepresented. He stated that the intent was to match the shopping center colors.

Chair Aitken asked about the dumpster location and Mr. Abramson indicated that the trash removal process would be handled on a daily basis. Mr. Bohaboy responded that the dumpster was located at the "end cap" of retail center 'A' which Mr. Breslau pointed out was nearby.

Chair Aitken expressed concerns about there being only one window and Mr. Bohaboy advised that windows were limited for security purposes and the eight-by-ten window was adequate for the small space. She asked about the one door in case of a fire and Mr. Engel indicated that it met Code.

Mr. Engel was concerned with the overhang clearance above the southern most lane and after some discussion, the technical details were worked out by pulling the soffit back two-to-three feet. Mr. Bohaboy indicated that he understood the suggestion and agreed that he had no problem doing that.

Mr. Evans mentioned that the roof tile sample differed from the existing clay roof tile in the shopping center. The sample was made of cement while the center's was a clay, barrel tile. Mr. Bohaboy stated that he would match the clay, barrel roof tiles.

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE

JULY 26, 2005

Mr. Breslau asked for clarification on the existing 45° angle parking as he was not sure how to interpret the plans. His concern was that the spaces were backing into the exit and he

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
JULY 26, 2005

would rather they be removed for a better and safer circulation pattern. Mr. Breslau also pointed out where a stop sign was needed in that vicinity. After some discussion, both problems were resolved by removing the angled parking spaces, realigning the curbing to create a two-way drive and adding a stop sign.

Chair Breslau expressed that the building lacked detail and the Committee agreed that banding would improve the appearance.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Engel, to approve based on the planning report and these items: 1) that the color of this building was to match the existing center, even if it required two or three colors and to add a stucco band around the columns and the building which if it was to match the existing building, it would be white with a separation between the two colors; 2) the roof was to be a clay barrel tile (not cement tiles) to match the existing center; 3) the soffit over the drive-thru at the south end should be pulled back to within one-foot of the face of the column to allow a 14-foot clear height underneath the roof overhang at the bypass lane; 4) on the east side of the existing eastern drive that was currently a one-way driveway, remove the current 45° angle parking spaces to reconfigure that area to a 22 to 24-foot two-way drive curbed on the east side, adding a little landscaping in what would become an island so that part of that area will allow a two-way drive circulation, all of which was to be reviewed by Engineering; 5) add a stop sign at the north end; and 6) that the stucco band which was to be added around the building and columns should be three-feet above finished floor. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Aitken - yes; Vice-Chair Engel - yes; Mr. Aucamp - absent; Mr. Breslau - yes; Mr. Evans - yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

5.4 SP 4-8-05, EPD Laboratory, 3211 College Avenue (CF)

Ms. Nolan advised that the University of Florida and Broward County were exempt from the Town's regulations under Florida State Statutes for universities. Since staff had been so impressed with the proposed laboratory, they requested that a presentation be made to this Committee and the Town Council in order to explain the innovative techniques that were being used in this building. Ms. Nolan thought it would be a learning experience for the architects as well as for the environmentally friendly members of the Committee.

Andrew Gunn of Falkanger Snyder Martineau & Yates Architects & Engineers, introduced Nancy Gassman, Phd., Director of Broward County Environmental Protection Department, Environmental Monitoring Division. Together they provided a presentation telling of the work that would be done at this building, the materials for the project, and the intent of the "LEED Criteria." When the presentation was completed, Mr. Gunn answered questions posed by the Committee.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Aitken - yes; Vice-Chair Engel - yes; Mr. Aucamp - absent; Mr. Breslau - yes; Mr. Evans - yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

5.2 SP 7-4-04, B & R Development I, 7780 Griffin Road (Commercial, B-2)

Ron Barr, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. Abramson read the planning report.

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE

JULY 26, 2005

Vice-Chair Engel had staff clarify that the ingress, egress, shared entrance feature to the east was at Griffin Road. Mr. Barr expounded on the access question and explained that the second shared access showed a dumpster location. He indicated that this was a measure taken as a matter of timing in order to move forward with the site plan while his neighbor to the east was going through the platting process.

Using renderings and color samples, Mr. Barr provided a presentation which explained the intent of the project. A lengthy discussion ensued with specific points of interest regarding the entrance canopy coverage; the indications of an elevator on the plans; marking crosswalks with pavers; the main ridge line of the roof; parking calculations to be based on the gross floor area; the limitation of uses based on the parking calculations; the overuse of the color green and suggestions on how to break it up; the proposed building signage; the listing of the parking tabulations; the lighting fixtures on Griffin Road as well as the internal light fixtures; review of the photometrics; and the review of the awning colors with staff.

After going through the list of staff's recommendations, Mr. Barr agreed to items two, four, five and six, but took issue with items one and three. The Committee agreed that item three should be eliminated; however, item one was discussed at length. This issue was resolved by restricting the use of parking space '70,' which Mr. Barr agreed would be done.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Engel, to approve based on the planning report except for item number three and that regarding item number one – to allow parking space number '70' to be a "staff only" space unless it eventually works out to become available due to the development of the property site to the east. 1) Correct the tabulations showing all the spaces and how they relate to parking, in other words, on each floor plan, label each area. 2) Indicate the crosswalks on the west and north with concrete pavers. 3) The light posts on the site were not to be FPL post-top fixtures as shown on the plans; they were all to be the three decorative posts also shown on the plans. 4) On the colors, to revisit awning, window and door colors and review selection with staff. 5) The sign band on the front of the building was to be made a consistent height for flexibility of the signs in the future. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Aitken – yes; Vice-Chair Engel – yes; Mr. Aucamp – absent; Mr. Breslau – yes; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

5.3 SP10-2-04, Dunkin Donuts, 3884 SW 64 Avenue (B-2)

Robert McIntire and George Deeb, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Gratz read the planning report. Upon completion of the report, it had been clarified that although the building met with the technical requirements of the district, it did not meet the intent of the district.

The definition of "fast-food use" needed to be clarified for the Committee's benefit and, therefore, Mr. Gratz read that part of the Code. As there was no table service proposed on the site, it was the Committee's opinion that the parking requirements needed to comply with the fast-food calculations. Ms. Nolan noted that the parking requirements in the Western Theme District may be different; however, upon checking, Mr. Gratz stated that they were the same. After some computing, it was determined that the site met the fast-food Code for parking requirements.

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE

JULY 26, 2005

Mr. McIntire addressed the issue of whether the project was in conformance with the mixed-use Regional Activity Center. It was his opinion that this building would provide a “social focal point” and enhance the diverse uses occurring in the center.

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
JULY 26, 2005

Chair Aitken expressed that she thought the building was cute; however, she understood that it was contrary to what the Town was trying to achieve for the downtown. She commented on the lack of any detail on the north and east elevations and noted that the canopy should continue to the full length of the north elevation. Vice-Chair Engel agreed noting that the north elevation would be the first side you would see when traveling south on Davie Road entering the downtown.

There was a brief discussion regarding the sidewalks and matching the brick-paver pattern on the site walkway which Mr. McIntire agreed to do to a point. Vice-Chair Engel offered technical advice on the configurations for the handicapped parking ramp which Mr. McIntire duly noted.

Mr. Breslau asked about providing bike racks and Mr. McIntire indicated that he would provide them. Mr. Breslau also suggested that the applicant try to encourage his clients to follow the Western Theme signage colors and lettering and again Mr. McIntire responded affirmatively.

Mr. Evans commented that he never had a site plan with dead-end parking as this site had proposed. He indicated that this was a major problem that would not work. A discussion ensued regarding possible alternatives and applying common sense to the situation. It concluded with the summation that the Western Theme would not be accomplished with the multi-uses as long as single-story, single-use buildings continued to be approved. Another discussion ensued regarding this dilemma and some examples of successful mixed-use projects had been pointed out.

Mr. Deeb spoke on behalf of the project and provided background information. He indicated that the plan had been changed four times and he had lost \$200,000 in the process. Mr. Deeb stated that he tried working with the Town to provide a beautiful new building despite the previous building having nothing wrong with it. Mr. Breslau advised that this Committee made recommendations and it was up to the Council to decide what would be done. Vice-Chair Engel explained that once a non-conforming use building had been vacated for a certain amount of time, the new building would have to meet the existing Code.

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Mr. Evans, to deny because the Committee was of the opinion that the Town would never accomplish what it expected of the downtown if it continued to approve parcel-by-parcel items which did not meet the intent of the Western Theme. He agreed that the use was a good use; however, the Western Theme Code was in place when the property was purchased and the intent of the Code was clear. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Aitken – yes; Vice-Chair Engel – yes; Mr. Aucamp – absent; Mr. Breslau – yes; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

The Committee requested that an addendum be submitted to Council so that the following comments may be implemented into the site plan should the Council decide to reverse the Committee's recommendation to deny.

- 1) Address the covered walkway on the north side of the building to be extended the entire length and that the east side of the building was totally barren.
- 2) The pavers at the corner were to match the current paver pattern.
- 3) To look at the handicapped space location due to the slope up to the building.
- 4) Bike racks were missing in the plans.

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
JULY 26, 2005

- 5) The Committee did not like the signage colors (corporate logo).
- 6) Parking arrangement had a dead end, no outlet parking area, which did not work.

5.5 SP 5-3-05, Shell Gas Station, 14810 Griffin Road (PUD, County)

Curt Keyser, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. Bachers summarized the planning report.

Mr. Keyser went over the color samples and explained that the company's international corporate colors were being incorporated in the canopy. He indicated that the same color scheme was approved for the Shell gas station located at Nova Drive and University Drive.

There was a brief discussion regarding a red, light emitting dial (LED) band being used in the plans. Ms. Nolan advised that anything illuminated would be regarded as signage and, thereby, subject to restrictions.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Engel, to approve based on the planning report. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Aitken - yes; Vice-Chair Engel - yes; Mr. Aucamp - absent; Mr. Breslau - yes; Mr. Evans - yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

6. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business discussed.

7. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business discussed.

8. COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

There were no comments and/or suggestions made.

9. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business and no objections, the meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Date Approved: _____

Chair/Committee Member